

The Scadding patent concerns a radiator arrangement for a motor vehicle in which a first intake duct 26 with a cooling air inlet opening is disposed upstream of a radiator 18 and a second intake duct with two cooling air outlet openings 28 and 30 is disposed connected downstream of the radiator. As the colored version of the Scadding patent drawing figure appended to this response shows, the radiator 18 is arranged between the first intake duct 26 and the second intake duct (not indicated by a reference number) and connected through upright flanges with corresponding flanges of both the first intake duct and the second intake duct. The two intake ducts mentioned are separately manufactured components which are then joined with the radiator 18; this is readily apparent from the different coloring of the individual parts in the appended drawing figure. The support for the Scadding radiator 18 has a configuration which cannot be determined from the sole illustration provided by the Scadding patent. Axial fans 20 drive air through the branch of the outlet duct leading to the opening 30. To allow these fans 20 to be inserted into the outlet duct branch, the second intake duct must be a separately manufactured part with a correspondingly large opening.

The Scadding system does not include a radiator accommodating arrangement supporting frame and an air guiding element constructed in one piece with such a supporting frame which, together with a rearward side of the radiator, forms a downstream-connected second air guiding duct as claim 34 particularly requires. The Scadding system also does not include a transversely extending air guide element constructed in one piece with a top part of the supporting frame which is connected to exterior side cheeks and to a rear upper

cross member edge as claim 34 specifies. The Scadding system thus fails to embody each and every limitation of claim 34, and, as a result, fails to anticipate claim 34.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 34 as anticipated by the Scadding patent is erroneous and should be withdrawn for reasons discussed above. Nothing relied on by the Examiner suggests modifying the Scadding system so as to meet the limitations mentioned, moreover, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 34 is patentable in its present form. The rest of the claims in this application are dependent claims and are patentable as well.

This application is considered to presently be in allowable form for reasons discussed above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated November 16, 2005, are in order and are requested.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #028987.52499US).

February 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd